



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/610,380	07/05/2000	Seong-jin Moon	1293.1072D/MDS	4176	
21171 7	7590 07/07/2003				
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			EXAMI	EXAMINER	
			TRAN, T	TRAN, THAI Q	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2615	17	
			DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003	n or	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	plicant(s)	(k)
Advisom, Action	09/610,380	MOON ET AL.	,
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thai Tran	2615	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 29 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this a	application. A proper reply twhich places the application	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mail b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W/706.07(f).	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date s e later than SIX MONTHS from the	e mailing date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Ottimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	d of extension and the correspondi of the shortened statutory period for ffice later than three months after	ing amount of the fee. The appropriate reply originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CI	t's Brief must be filed within FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismi	the period set forth in issal of the appeal.	
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or se	arch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);	•	
(c)	in better form for appeal by	materially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding numb	er of finally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woul canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: _	or reconsideration has been 	considered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v	nt(s) a)⊠ will not be entere would be rejected is provide	d or b)⊡ will be entered a d below or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>4-10 and 15-46</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on i	s a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ o	disapproved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)	
10. Other:			

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)



Contine attion of 2. NOTE: adding "and/or reproducing" in claim 4, line 1, deleting "rewritable" in claim 4, line 2 and deleting ", and made a second determination whether the optical pickup is to read the content based upon the first determination" in claim 31, last three lines raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections have not been addressed and it appears that the references can not be combined.

PRIMARY EXAMINER